



**UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS  
EL PASO**

**College of Education- Department of Teacher Education**

<b>Title of Course:</b> TED 6397 SEC 001 CRN 14839 – <b>Doctoral Proposal Writing Seminar</b>	<b>Instructor Information:</b> Name: Pei-Ling Hsu
<b>Semester:</b> 2019 Fall	Email: <a href="mailto:phsu3@utep.edu">phsu3@utep.edu</a>
<b>Day/Time:</b> Mondays, 5:30-8:20pm	Website: <a href="http://peilinghsu.utep.edu">http://peilinghsu.utep.edu</a>
<b>Credits:</b> 3	Office: 813, Education Building
<b>Class hours:</b> 3 hours/week	Office hours: 2:30-5:30pm, Tuesdays

**Course Description:** Preparation of dissertation proposal. Student must successfully complete the course prior to scheduling the proposal hearing. Students may repeat this course if they cannot complete it the first time. If students are unsuccessful the second time, then the Probation/Dismissal Procedure will be initiated.

**Pre-requisites**

Students have formed a Dissertation Committee and successfully defended their Portfolios.

**Grade for TED 6397**

TED 6397 is a required course for all TLC students and is graded on a scale of Successful (S)/Unsatisfactory (U).

- Satisfactory (S): A student successfully defends his/her dissertation proposal by the end of the Semester
- Under Construction/Unsatisfactory (U): A student does not successfully defend his/her dissertation proposal by the end of the Semester

This course is designed to support students’ writing for their dissertation proposals. However, the grade is solely dependent on whether students defend their dissertation proposals to their dissertation committee successfully by the end of the semester. Neither the S or U grade is calculated as part of the GPA. The grade (S or U) will be assigned by the course instructor, in consultation with the dissertation chair. TED 6397 falls under the Graduate School’s policy of “continuous enrollment,” meaning that the course must be repeated in the following semester if a grade of “U” is assigned. For each assignment, a 2-1-0 range score will be given in Blackboard to reflect students’ work progress: “0” (Does not Meet Standards), “1” (Meets Standards), “2” (Exceeds Standards). Rubrics to evaluate assignments can be found in Appendix 1, 2, and 3 at the end of the syllabus.

**TLC Interim Policy in the PhD Program in Teaching, Learning, and Culture**

As an interim policy, students who received a “U” in TED 6397 may take an Independent Study (TED 6395) with their dissertation chair that must culminate with a proposal hearing before the final day of class for that semester. If students are unsuccessful the second time (in TED 6397 or TED 6395), then the Probation/Dismissal Procedure will be initiated.

## Readings

### 1) Reading Packet 1 (Dissertation Proposal):

- 1-1: Cassuto, L. (Feb., 11, 2011). *Demystifying the dissertation proposal*. The Chronicle of Higher Education. Retrieved from: <http://chronicle.com/article/Demystifying-the-Dissertation/128916>
- 1-2: *Writing thesis and dissertation proposals*, The Graduate Writing Center of the Center for Excellence in Writing (PSU).
- 1-3: Kilbourn, B. (2006). The qualitative doctoral dissertation proposal. *Teachers College Record*, 4, 529-576.
- 1-4: Ivankova, N. (2002). A sample mixed methods dissertation proposal.

### 2) Reading Packet 2 (Conceptual Framework):

- 2-1: Grant, C., & Osanloo, A. (2014). Understanding, selecting, and integrating a theoretical framework in dissertation research: Creating the blueprint for your “house.” *Administrative Issues Journal: Connecting Education, Practice, and Research*, 4(2), 12-26.
- 2-2: Maxwell, J. A. (2005). Conceptual framework: What do you think is going on? *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach* (pp. 33-64). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- 2-3: Creswell, J. W. (2014). The use of theory. *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4<sup>th</sup> Ed., pp. 51-76). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

### 3) Reading Packet 3 (Literature Review):

- 3-1: Creswell, J. W. (2014). Review of the literature. *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4<sup>th</sup> Ed., pp. 25-50). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- 3-2: Machi, L. A., & EcEvoy, B. T. (2016). Step six - Write the review. *The Literature review: Six steps to success* (3<sup>rd</sup> Ed., pp. 133-156). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

### 4) Reading Packet 4 (Research Design):

- 4-1: Creswell, J. W. (2014). The selection of a research approach. *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4<sup>th</sup> Ed., pp. 3-24). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- 4-2: Creswell, J. W. (2014). Quantitative methods. *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4<sup>th</sup> Ed., pp. 155-182). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- 4-3: Creswell, J. W. (2015). Collecting quantitative data. *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4<sup>th</sup> Ed, pp. 140-173). India: Pearson.
- 4-4: Creswell, J. W. (2014). Qualitative methods. *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4<sup>th</sup> Ed., pp. 183-214). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- 4-5: Creswell, J. W. (2015). Collecting qualitative data. *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4<sup>th</sup> Ed., pp. 204-235). India: Pearson.
- 4-6: Yazan, B. (2015). Three approaches to case study methods in education: Yin, Merriam, and Stake. *The Qualitative Report*, 20(2), 134-152.

- 4-7: Creswell, J. W. (2013). Steps in conducting a scholarly mixed methods study. DBER Speaker Series, Paper 48. <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/dberspeakers/48>
  - 4-8: Creswell, J. W. (2014). Mixed methods procedures. *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4<sup>th</sup> Ed., pp. 215-240). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
  - 4-9: Creswell J. W. (2011). Controversies in mixed methods research. In N. K. Denzin, & Y. S. Lincoln, *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research*, (4<sup>th</sup> Ed., pp. 269-83). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- 5) Reading Packet 5 (Research Quality):
- 5-1: Guba, E., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1989). *Judging the Quality of Fourth Generation Evaluation*. (pp. 228-254). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
  - 5-2: Ritchie, J., Lewis, J., Nicholls, C. M., & Ormston, R. (2014). Generalizing from qualitative research. *Qualitative research practice: A guide for social science students & researchers* (pp. 347-366). London: Sage.
  - 5-3: O’Cathain, A. (2010). Assessing the quality of mixed methods research. In A. Tashakkori & C. Teddlie (Eds), *Mixed methods in social & behavioral research* (pp. 531-558). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- 6) Reading Packet 6 (Proposal Defense):
- 6-1: Cone, J. D. & Foster, S. L. (2006). Managing committee meetings: Proposal and oral defense. *Dissertations and these from start to finish* (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed., pp. 289-312). Washington, DC: APA.

All the readings above are available in Blackboard. Students are responsible to identify readings that are relevant to the topics of their dissertations.

**Student Learning Outcomes:**

Students will be able to:	Measurements/Assignments:
1. Develop readiness and capacity for conducting a doctoral research	(1) Portfolio, (2) CITI training certificates
2. Choose an appropriate research topic and be familiar with research done about the topic	(1) Three relevant dissertations, (2) Three relevant dissertation review
3. Develop researchable questions or themes to be addressed in the dissertation	Blueprint – Draft 1, Blueprint – Draft 2, Blueprint – Draft 3
4. Develop the logic of dissertation proposal content organization	(1) Table of Content - Draft 1, (2) Powerpoint – Table of Content, (3) Table of Content - Draft 2, (4) Table of Content meeting results
5. Provide a scholarly rationale for the importance of the topic	(1) Chapter 1 - Draft 1, (2) Powerpoint – Chapter 1, (3) Chapter 1 - Draft 2, (4) Chapter 1 meeting results
6. Refine literature review and identify appropriate theoretical frameworks	(1) Chapter 2 - Draft 1, (2) Powerpoint – Chapter 2, (3) Chapter 2 - Draft 2, (4) Chapter 2 meeting results

7. Design appropriate research methods with specific analytical tools and timeline to complete the data collection	(1) Chapter 3 - Draft 1, (2) Powerpoint – Chapter 3, (3) Chapter 3 - Draft 2, (4) Chapter 3 meeting results
8. Refine the logical relationships between research questions, theoretical frameworks, and methods	(1) Proposal - Draft 1, (2) Powerpoint – Proposal, (3) Proposal - Draft 2, (4) Proposal meeting results
9. Defend their dissertation proposals to their dissertation committee	(1) Powerpoint - Mock Proposal Defense

**Standards of academic integrity:** Students are expected to uphold the highest standards of academic integrity. Any form of scholastic dishonesty is an affront to the pursuit of knowledge and jeopardizes the quality of the degree awarded to all graduates of UTEP. Any student who commits an act of scholastic dishonesty is subject to discipline. Scholastic dishonesty includes, but is not limited to: cheating, plagiarism, collusion [making plans to cheat with another], the submission for credit of any work or materials that are not attributable in whole or in part to another person, taking an examination for another person, any act designed to give unfair advantage to a student or the attempt to commit such acts. Proven violations of the detailed regulations, as printed in the Handbook of Operating Procedures (HOP) and available in the Office of the Dean of Students, may result in sanctions ranging from disciplinary probation, to failing grades on the work in question, to failing grades in the course, to suspension or dismissal among others.

**Students with Disabilities statement:** If you have or believe you have a disability; you may wish to self-identify. You can do so by providing documentation to the Center for Accommodations and Support Services (CASS) located in Union E Room 106. Students who have been designated as having a disability must reactivate their standing with CASS on a yearly basis. Failure to report to this office will place a student on the inactive list and nullify benefits received. If you have a condition which may affect your ability to exit safely from the premises in an emergency or which may cause an emergency during class, you are encouraged to discuss this in confidence with the instructor and/or the director of CASS. You may call 919-747-5148 for general information about the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).

**Student Conduct and Discipline:** All students are expected and required to obey the law and to comply with Regent, Rules, and Regulations (<http://www.utsystem.edu/bor/rules>) with system and University rules, with directives issued by an administrative official in the course of his or her authorized duties and to observe the standards of conduct appropriate for the university.

**Equal Opportunity:** All students regardless of gender, age, class, race, religion, physical disability, sexual orientation, etc., shall have equal opportunity without harassment in this course. Any problems with or questions related to this can be discussed confidentially with the instructor.

### **Scholarly Tools & Resources**

1. Pei-Ling Hsu's personal website: <http://peilinghsu.utep.edu>

2. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global : <https://0-search-proquest-com.lib.utep.edu/pqdtglobal/advanced?accountid=7121>
3. American Doctoral Dissertations: <http://0-web.b.ebscohost.com.lib.utep.edu/ehost/search/advanced?vid=0&sid=2d4941da-a556-4391-aa68-c865a493819a%40sessionmgr102>
4. Free DOI Look Up – Crossref: <https://www.crossref.org/guestquery/>
5. Scimago Journal & Country Rank: <https://www.scimagojr.com/>
6. Zotero (Online Reference Organization): <https://www.zotero.org/>
7. Mendeley (Reference Management): <https://www.mendeley.com/homepage5/?switchedFrom=>
8. LucidChart (Create diagrams on line): <https://www.lucidchart.com/>
9. OWL- Purdue Online Writing Lab: [https://owl.purdue.edu/owl/purdue\\_owl.html](https://owl.purdue.edu/owl/purdue_owl.html)
10. Research Guide (University of Southern California): <http://libguides.usc.edu/writingguide>

### **Assignments:**

All assignments should be submitted to Blackboard and all due dates are listed in Table 1.

#### **1. Portfolio (1 point):**

Please submit your Portfolio to Blackboard.

#### **2. CITI training certificates (1 point):**

Please go to CITI Program: <https://www.citiprogram.org/>, create an account, and complete these two courses: (1) Responsible Conduct in Research (RCR): Social and Behavioral Responsible Conduct of Research Course, (2) Human Subjects Research (HSR): Social & Behavioral Research Investigators. There is no cost for these two courses and will take some hours to complete. Please submit these two certificates to Blackboard.

#### **3. Blueprints (9 points)**

The assignments of blueprints were to help students form a logic and capture a the big picture for their dissertation proposals. A rubric for these assignments can be found in Appendix 1.

##### **1) Three relevant dissertations (1 point)**

Students will submit 3 quality dissertations relevant to students' topics. Please submit the assignment to Blackboard.

##### **2) Three relevant dissertation review (2 points)**

Students will review 3 relevant dissertations using Template 1. Please submit the assignment to Blackboard.

##### **3) Blueprint – Draft 1 (2 points)**

Students will produce a blueprint draft 1 using Template 2. Please submit the assignment to Blackboard.

##### **4) Blueprint – Draft 2 (2 points)**

Students will produce a blueprint draft 2 to improve the blueprint draft 1 using Template 2. Please submit the assignment to Blackboard.

##### **5) Blueprint – Draft 3 (2 points)**

Students will produce a blueprint draft 3 to improve the blueprint draft 2 using

Template 2. Please submit the assignment to Blackboard.

4. **Table of Content (7 points):** Students will create a logical, detailed, and well-written Table of Contents for the first three chapters of the dissertation. The following 4 sub-assignments are designed to support students for this assignment. A rubric for this assignment can be found in Appendix 2.
  - 1) **Table of Content - Draft 1 (2 points)**  
Students will generate a table of content – draft 1 and submit it to (1) Blackboard and (2) Email to the Chair and cc the instructor.
  - 2) **Powerpoint – Table of Content (2 points)**  
Students will submit their powerpoint to Blackboard and present their table of content to the class to receive oral feedback. A paper-copy (3 slides per page) of this powerpoint file should be handed to the instructor before the class on their presentation day.
  - 3) **Table of Content - Draft 2 (2 points)**  
Students will generate a table of content – draft 2 to address feedback from the instructor and peers in the class and submit it to (1) Blackboard and (2) Email to the Chair and cc the instructor.
  - 4) **Table of Content meeting results (1 point)**  
Students will use Template 3 and submit the meeting results with their chair on the table of content to Blackboard.
  
5. **Chapter 2 (7 points):** Students will create a logical, detailed, and well-written for chapter 2 of the dissertation. The following 4 sub-assignments are designed to support students for this assignment. A rubric for this assignment can be found in Appendix 2.
  - 1) **Chapter 2 - Draft 1 (2 points)**  
Students will generate chapter 2 – draft 1 and submit it to (1) Blackboard and (2) Email to the Chair and cc the instructor.
  - 2) **Powerpoint – Chapter 2 (2 points)**  
Students will submit their powerpoint to Blackboard and present their chapter 2 to the class to receive oral feedback. A paper-copy (3 slides per page) of this powerpoint file should be handed to the instructor before the class on their presentation day.
  - 3) **Chapter 2 - Draft 2 (2 points)**  
Students will generate a chapter 2 – draft 2 to address feedback from the instructor and peers in the class and submit it to (1) Blackboard and (2) Email to the Chair and cc the instructor.
  - 4) **Chapter 2 meeting results (1 point)**  
Students will use Template 4 and submit the meeting results with their chair on chapter 2 to Blackboard.
  
6. **Chapter 3 (7 points):** Students will create a logical, detailed, and well-written for chapter 3 of the dissertation. The following 4 sub-assignments are designed to support students for this assignment. A rubric for this assignment can be found in Appendix 2.
  - 1) **Chapter 3 - Draft 1 (2 points)**  
Students will generate chapter 3 – draft 1 and submit it to (1) Blackboard and (2) Email to the Chair and cc the instructor.

- 2) **Powerpoint – Chapter 3 (2 points)**  
Students will submit their powerpoint to Blackboard and present their chapter 3 to the class to receive oral feedback. A paper-copy (3 slides per page) of this powerpoint file should be handed to the instructor before the class on their presentation day.
  - 3) **Chapter 3 - Draft 2 (2 points)**  
Students will generate chapter 3 – draft 2 to address feedback from the instructor and peers in the class and submit it to (1) Blackboard and (2) Email to the Chair and cc the instructor.
  - 4) **Chapter 3 meeting results (1 point)**  
Students will use Template 5 and submit the meeting results with their chair on the chapter 3 to Blackboard.
7. **Chapter 1 (7 points):** Students will create a logical, detailed, and well-written for chapter 1 of the dissertation. The following 4 sub-assignments are designed to support students for this assignment. A rubric for this assignment can be found in Appendix 2.
- 1) **Chapter 1 - Draft 1 (2 points)**  
Students will generate chapter 1 – draft 1 and submit it to (1) Blackboard and (2) Email to the Chair and cc the instructor.
  - 2) **Powerpoint – Chapter 1 (2 points)**  
Students will submit their powerpoint to Blackboard and present their chapter 1 to the class to receive oral feedback. A paper-copy (3 slides per page) of this powerpoint file should be handed to the instructor before the class on their presentation day.
  - 3) **Chapter 1 - Draft 2 (2 points)**  
Students will generate chapter 1 – draft 2 to address feedback from the instructor and peers in the class and submit it to (1) Blackboard and (2) Email to the Chair and cc the instructor.
  - 4) **Chapter 1 meeting results (1 point)**  
Students will use Template 6 and submit the meeting results with their chair on chapter 1 to Blackboard.
8. **Proposal (7 points):** Students will create a logical, detailed, and well-written for the proposal of the dissertation. The following 4 sub-assignments are designed to support students for this assignment. A rubric for this assignment can be found in Appendix 2.
- 1) **Proposal - Draft 1 (2 points)**  
Students will generate the proposal – draft 1 and submit it to (1) Blackboard and (2) Email to the Chair and cc the instructor.
  - 2) **Powerpoint – Proposal (2 points)**  
Students will submit their powerpoint to Blackboard and present their proposal to the class to receive oral feedback. A paper-copy (3 slides per page) of this powerpoint file should be handed to the instructor before the class on their presentation day.
  - 3) **Proposal - Draft 2 (2 points)**  
Students will generate the proposal – draft 2 to address feedback from the instructor and peers in the class and submit it to (1) Blackboard and (2) Email to the Chair and cc the instructor.
  - 4) **Proposal meeting results (1 point)**  
Students will use Template 7 and submit the meeting results with their chair on

proposal to Blackboard.

**9. Powerpoint - Mock Proposal Defense (2 points):**

Each student will have 15 minutes to present a mock proposal defense to the public audience and submit its powerpoint to Blackboard. A rubric for this assignment can be found in Appendix 3. A paper-copy (3 slides per page) of this powerpoint file should be handed to the instructor before the class on their presentation day.

**Course Requirements:**

1. All assignments should be submitted through the Blackboard system and use WORD files or Powerpoint files. File names should start with “your name” and end with “the assignment name”. There should be no space in between. Taking the name of “Isaac Newton” for example.
  - 1) IsaacNewton-Portfolio.pdf
  - 2) IsaacNewton-CITI-certificates.pdf
  - 3) IsaacNewton-Table-of-Content-Draft1.doc
  - 4) IsaacNewton-Powerpoint-Table-of-Content.ppt
  - 5) IsaacNewton-Table-of-Content-Draft2.doc
  - 6) IsaacNewton-Table-of-Content-meeting-results.doc
2. Due dates are specified in Table 1 and due time is **12:00AM (midnight)** for ALL electronic submissions.

**Set up Your Dissertation Proposal Defense:**

1. When students’ chairs decide the proposal is ready, students submit their finalized proposals to the doctoral committee and coordinate a date for the dissertation proposal defense to the dissertation committee, who should have at least 3 weeks to review the proposal.
2. Once a date is determined. Students will submit the date and a room schedule request form to the Program Coordinator, who will reserve a room

**IRB Requirement for Your Dissertation:**

1. Only after the IRB (Internal Review Board) proposal is approved can students begin their research.
2. Students may work with their dissertation chairs to submit their IRB proposals while taking TED 6397 or after.

**Support for Scholarly Writing**

Students are strongly encouraged to seek writing support from following resources:

- 1) Students’ dissertation committee
- 2) Writing groups with peers
- 3) Writing workshops (e.g., by the Graduate School)
- 4) University Writing Center
- 5) Online resources (e.g., see the “scholarly tools and resources” section in the syllabus)



**Table 1. Course Schedule:** Changes may be made during the classes. Students should follow the latest changes.

No	Date	Topics & Activities	Readings before the class	Assignments Due (12:00am-midnight) All assignments are submitted to BB EE: Extra Email to the Chair & cc Dr. Hsu
01	Aug 27 F2F	-Review syllabus & Syllabus test -Searching dissertations -Dissertation –Table of Content		
02	Sep 3 F2F	-Review relevant dissertations -Complete CITI online trainings -Table of Content	Review 3 relevant dissertations	1. Portfolio 2. CITI training certificates 3-1. Three relevant dissertations 3-2. Three dissertations review (Template1) 4-1. Table of Content Draft 1 (EE) 4-2. Powerpoint – Table of Content
03	Sep 10	-Meet with the dissertation chair to discuss Table of Content (Template 3)	Reading packet 1- Dissertation proposal	4-3. Table of Content Draft 2 (EE) 5-1. Chapter 2 Draft 1 (EE)
04	Sep 17 F2F	-Blueprint for proposal -Conceptual framework	Reading packet 2- Conceptual framework	3-3. Blueprint – Draft 1 (Template 2) 4-4. Table of Content meeting results (Template 3) 5-2. Powerpoint- Chapter 2
05	Sep 24	- Meet with the dissertation chair to discuss Chapter 2 (Template 4)		5-3. Chapter 2 Draft 2 (EE)
06	Oct 1 F2F	-Literature review	Reading packet 3- Literature review	6-1. Chapter 3 Draft 1 (EE) 6-2. Powerpoint - Chapter 3
07	Oct 8	-Meet with the dissertation chair to discuss Chapter 3 (Template 5) -Research methods		3-4. Blueprint – Draft 2 (Template 2) 5-4. Chapter 2 meeting results (Template 4) 6-3. Chapter 3 Draft 2 (EE)
08	Oct 15 F2F	-Chapter 1-Introduction -Meet with the dissertation chair to discuss Chapter 1 (Template 6)	Reading packet 4- Research design	7-1. Chapter 1 Draft 1 (EE) 7-2. Powerpoint- Chapter 1
09	Oct 22	-Blueprint for proposal		3-5. Blueprint – Draft 3 (Template 2) 6-4. Chapter 3 meeting results (Template 5)
10	Oct 29 F2F	-Research quality	Reading packet 5- Research quality	7-3. Chapter 1 Draft 2 (EE) 8-1. Proposal Draft 1 (EE)
11	Nov 5	-Meet with the dissertation chair to discuss Proposal (Template 7)		7-4. Chapter 1 meeting results (Template 6)
12	Nov 12 F2F	-Dissertation Proposal Defense	Reading packet 6- Proposal defense	8-2. Powerpoint – Proposal 8-3. Proposal Draft 2 (EE)
13	Nov 19 F2F	-Mock Presentation		8-4. Proposal meeting results (Template 7) 9. Powerpoint – Mock Proposal Defense
14	Nov 26	-Individual meetings		-Time to set up your Proposal Defense!!!
15	Dec 3	-Individual meetings		-Time to set up your Proposal Defense!!!

**Appendix 1: Rubric for Evaluating “Review 3 dissertations”**

Assignment	Exceeds Standards 2	Meets Standards 1	Does not Meet Standards 0
Blueprints (3 dissertation review & drafts 1, 2, and 3)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Student has selected relevant dissertations.</li> <li>-Student is able to identify all key components of a dissertation for all 3 dissertations</li> <li>- Student is able to clearly articulate all key components for his/her own dissertation</li> <li>-These points are well supported with valid arguments and elaborations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Student has selected relevant dissertations</li> <li>- Student can identify the major components of a dissertation for all 3 dissertations</li> <li>- Student is able to clearly articulate major key components for his/her own dissertation</li> <li>- The majority of these points are well-articulated</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Student has not selected relevant dissertations.</li> <li>- Student can only identify a few components of a dissertation for all 3 dissertations</li> <li>- Student can only articulate a few key components for his/her own dissertation</li> <li>- These points are not articulated and not convincing</li> </ul>

**Appendix 2: Rubric for Evaluating Dissertation Proposal Components**

Assignment	Exceeds Standards 2	Meets Standards 1	Does not Meet Standards 0
Table of Content	-Student has created a logical, detailed, and well-written Table of Contents for the first three chapters of the dissertation	-Student’s Table of Contents follows a logical order and has sufficient detail.	-Student’s Table of Contents is not logical or is non-existent.
Chapter 2	-Student has created a theoretical framework and a literature review that flow together and is comprehensive.	-Student’s theoretical framework and revised literature review are beginning to flow together.	-Student’s theoretical framework does not fit with the research design. -Student’s literature review has not been expanded/revised.
Chapter 1	-Student has developed an introduction that situates the study and offers a rationale for conducting the study. -Student has a do-able timeline developed.	-Student’s introduction begins to explain a rationale for conducting the study. -Student’s timeline is do-able.	-Student’s introduction does not present an argument as to why the study should be done. -Student’s timeline is not do-able. -Student’s introduction and timeline are non-existent.
Chapter 3	-Student has developed a methods chapter that details the plan for data collection and a plan for data analysis. -Student’s plan situates the	-Student’s methods chapter is beginning to come together and become coherent. -Students’ plan begins to	-Student’s methods chapter is not coherent. -Student’s methods chapter does not relate to the methods literature.

	data collection in the literature.	situate the data collection in the literature.	-Student's methods chapter does not exist.
Appendixes	-Attach all necessary information that help readers understand the project (e.g., instruments, curriculum, working sheets)	-Attach most of the relevant information that help readers understand the project (e.g., instruments, curriculum, working sheets)	-Attach only part of relevant information that help readers understand the project (e.g., instruments, curriculum, working sheets)
Mechanics of English	-Appropriate expression of concepts, varied and accurate vocabulary, no errors occur with regards to grammar, conventions and spelling. -Follow APA format	-Clear expression and vocabulary, some mechanical errors exist but not to get in the way of understanding. -Have some APA format errors	-Some mechanical errors exist but not to get in the way of understanding. -Many errors with regards to grammar, spelling, and conventions. -There is no obvious APA formatting structure

### Appendix 3: Evaluation of Mock Dissertation Proposal Presentations

Assignment	Exceeds Standards 2	Meets Standards 1	Does not Meet Standards 0
Mock Presentation	-Obtain average ranking of 4-5	-Obtain average ranking of 2-3.9	-Obtain average ranking of 0-2

*Please rate the student's performance, with 5 as the best and 1 as needs the most work. Include any comments you have to help the student improve the proposal.*

1. Is the problem to be studied discussed clearly and compellingly?

Need much work 1	Need more work 2	Okay 3	Good 4	Excellent 5
Comments:				

2. Is the theoretical framework explicitly explained?

Need much work 1	Need more work 2	Okay 3	Good 4	Excellent 5
Comments:				

3. Are the most pertinent aspects of the literature(s) critically discussed?

Need much work 1	Need more work 2	Okay 3	Good 4	Excellent 5
Comments:				

4. Are the methods clearly explained and appropriate for the questions?

Need much work 1	Need more work 2	Okay 3	Good 4	Excellent 5
Comments:				

5. What suggestions to you have for the student?

Comments:
-----------